

RLH



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
 United States Patent and Trademark Office
 Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
 P.O. Box 1450
 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/990,840	11/21/2001	Peter Irma August Barri	RAL920000112US2	3016
25299	7590	12/08/2004	EXAMINER	
IBM CORPORATION PO BOX 12195 DEPT 9CCA, BLDG 002 RESEARCH TRIANGLE PARK, NC 27709			PEUGH, BRIAN R	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2187	

DATE MAILED: 12/08/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/990,840	BARRI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Brian R. Peugh	2187	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 September 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9, 24-28, 33 and 34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 24-27, 33, and 34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 5-9 and 28 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

This Office Action is in response to applicant's communication filed September 20, 2004, in response to PTO Office Action dated June 16, 2004. The applicant's remarks and amendment to the specification and/or claims were considered with the results that follow.

Claims 1-9, 24-28, 33, and 34 have been presented for examination in this application. In response to the last Office Action, claims 29-32 have been cancelled.

Claim Objections

Claim 33 is objected to because of the following informalities: The Examiner believes that the claim was mistakenly identified as "Claim 32" in the September 20, 2004 response, and should have been labeled as --Claim 33--. The Examiner will interpret the claimed subject matter as Claim 33. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Claims 1-4, 25, 26, 33, and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Bass et al. (US# 6,460,120)

The applied reference has a common assignee with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) might be overcome either by a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not the invention "by another," or by an appropriate showing under 37 CFR 1.131.

Regarding claim 1, Bass et al. teaches, as seen in Figure 13, **multiple (N) different memories** such as DRAM memories. Each of these memories is attached to an associated one of the **multiple (M) different buses**, which inherently facilitate data movement according to a certain bandwidth. A plurality of arbiters (**different memory controllers**) are coupled to the multiple different memories, and these different memory controllers comprise the TSM **Arbiter**. The plurality of arbiters of the TSM Arbiter control the accessing of the memories, as well as the modes for accessing the memories. The

Art Unit: 2187

memories can be **set into two modes of operation** (col. 24, lines 36-63). Bass et al. further teaches that the memories are logically divided into sub-memories, and that these sub-memories can be logically **accessed simultaneously**. The arbiter of Bass et al. allows for such accesses in the form of writes or **read accesses** (col. 25, lines 10-18). The **access vector** as claimed refers to the logical address translation for data from the memory that must inherently occur due to the logical division of the memories and the associated logical simultaneous access. Although the Bass et al. reference does not specifically recite bandwidth in terms of the busses and memories, Bass et al. teaches that data can be read from the memories, which would inherently mean that the data travels at some speed relative to the bandwidth of the busses. Since Bass et al. also teaches that multiple memories may be read from simultaneously, the multiple pieces of data will be read over the multiple buses at the same time. Thus, **total bandwidth of all of the separate busses** related to the simultaneous read access is inherently **greater than the bandwidth of an individual bus** in the Bass et al. invention.

Regarding claim 2, Bass et al. teaches that the first mode may be a **read mode**, which is a sub-section of the TDM-mode in the form of read-only (col. 24, lines 59-63).

Regarding claim 3, Bass et al. teaches that the memory options may include multi-bank **DDR DRAM** (col. 9, lines 46-48).

Regarding claim 4, Bass et al. teaches partitioning the memory into at least **four banks with a buffer spread across the four banks** (col. 9, lines 55-60).

Regarding claim 25, Bass et al. teaches, as seen in Figure 13, **multiple (N) different memories** such as DRAM memories. Each of these memories is attached to an associated one of the **multiple (M) different busses**, which inherently facilitate data movement according to a certain bandwidth. A plurality of arbiters (**different memory controllers**) are coupled to the multiple different memories, and these different memory controllers comprise the TSM **Arbiter**. The arbiters of the TSM Arbiter control the accessing of the memories, as well as the modes for accessing the memories. The memories can be **set into two modes of operation** (col. 24, lines 36-63). Bass et al. further teaches that the memories are logically divided into sub-memories, and that these sub-memories can be logically **accessed simultaneously**. The arbiter of Bass et al. allows for such accesses in the form of writes or **read accesses** (col. 25, lines 10-18).

Regarding claim 26, although the Bass et al. reference does not specifically recite bandwidth in terms of the busses and memories, Bass et al. teaches that data can be read from the memories, which would inherently mean that the data travels at some speed relative to the bandwidth of the busses. Since Bass et al. also teaches that multiple memories may be read from simultaneously, the multiple pieces of data will be read over the multiple busses at the same time. Thus, **total bandwidth of all of the activated separate busses** related to the simultaneous read access is inherently **greater than the bandwidth of an individual bus** in the Bass et al. invention.

Regarding claim 33, Bass et al. teaches, as seen in Figure 13, **multiple (N) different memories** such as DRAM memories. The DRAMs are divided (**partitioned**) into multiple **sectors** (submemories). Each of these memories is attached to an associated one of the multiple **(M) different buses**, which inherently facilitate data movement according to a certain bandwidth. Bass et al. **teaches partitioning the memory** into at least **four banks with a buffer spread across the four banks** (col. 9, lines 55-60). A plurality of arbiters (**memory controllers**) are coupled to the **multiple different memories**, and these different memory controllers comprise the TSM **Arbiter**. The plurality of arbiters of the TSM Arbiter control the accessing of the memories, as well as the modes for accessing the memories. The memories can be **set into two modes of operation** (col. 24, lines 36-63;). Bass et al. further teaches that the memories are logically divided into sub-memories, and that these sub-memories can be logically **accessed simultaneously**. The arbiter of Bass et al. allows for such **write control signals for accesses in the form of writes** or read accesses (col. 25, lines 5-31).

Regarding claim 34, The TSM Arbiter responds to a **read signal** for read accesses from any (**another**) of the **at least two of said N different memory elements** (col. 5, lines 25-31).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Bartoldus et al. (US# 6,560,227) in view of Bass et al. (US# 6,460,120).

The applied reference has a common assignee with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art only under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) might be overcome by: (1) a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not an invention "by another"; (2) a showing of a date of invention for the claimed subject matter of the application which corresponds to subject matter disclosed but not claimed in the reference, prior to the effective U.S. filing date of the reference under 37 CFR 1.131; or (3) an oath or declaration under 37 CFR 1.130 stating that the application and reference are currently owned by the same party and that the inventor named in the application is the prior inventor under 35 U.S.C. 104, together with a terminal disclaimer in accordance with 37 CFR 1.321(c). For applications filed on or after November 29, 1999, this rejection might also be overcome by showing that the subject matter of the reference and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned

by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person. See MPEP § 706.02(I)(1) and § 706.02(I)(2).

Bartoldus et al., teaches a chip (controller) for **partitioning a frame** into **at least two parts (segments)**, where the segments are stored in N sets of 74 byte ping pong buffers (**plurality of memory elements**) (col. 2, lines 12-20). The segments are (**adjoining**) parts of the same frame, where the frame is sent over various LAN switches (**communication device**) and routing devices (col. 2, lines 1-11).

The difference between the claimed subject matter and that of Bartoldus et al., disclosed supra, is that claim 24 recites that an arbiter, in response to a request, causes data (parts) to be read simultaneously from the memory elements over separate busses.

Regarding claim 24, Bass et al. teaches, as seen in Figure 13, **multiple (N) different memories** such as DRAM memories. Each of these memories is attached to an associated one of the multiple (**M**) **different buses**, which inherently facilitate data movement according to a certain bandwidth. A plurality of arbiters (**different memory controllers**) are coupled to the multiple different memories, and these different memory controllers comprise the TSM **Arbiter**. The arbiters of the TSM Arbiter control the accessing of the memories, as well as the modes for accessing the memories. The memories can be **set into two modes of operation** (col. 24, lines 36-63). Bass et al. further teaches that the memories are logically divided into sub-memories, and that these sub-memories can be logically **accessed simultaneously**. The arbiter of Bass et

Art Unit: 2187

al. allows for such accesses in the form of writes or **read accesses** (col. 25, lines 10-18).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art having the teachings of Bartoldus et al. and Bass et al. before him at the time the invention was made to modify the network system of Bartoldus et al. to include the simultaneous access memories of Bass et al., because then the requested data could be retrieved from the memories in a quicker fashion and use less processing cycles.

Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Bartoldus et al. (US# 6,560,227) in view of Bass et al. (US# 6,460,120) and Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (AAPA).

The applied reference has a common assignee with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art only under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) might be overcome by: (1) a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not an invention "by another"; (2) a showing of a date of invention for the claimed subject matter of the application which corresponds to subject matter disclosed but not claimed in the reference, prior to the effective U.S. filing date of the reference under 37 CFR 1.131; or (3) an oath or declaration under 37 CFR 1.130 stating that the application and reference are currently owned by the same party and that the inventor named in the application is the prior inventor under 35 U.S.C. 104, together with a terminal disclaimer

in accordance with 37 CFR 1.321(c). For applications filed on or after November 29, 1999, this rejection might also be overcome by showing that the subject matter of the reference and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person. See MPEP § 706.02(l)(1) and § 706.02(l)(2).

Bartoldus et al., teaches a chip (controller) for **partitioning a frame into at least two parts (segments)**, where the segments are stored in N sets of 74 byte ping pong buffers (**plurality of memory elements**) (col. 2, lines 12-20). The segments are (**adjoining**) parts of the same frame, where the frame is sent over various LAN switches (**communication device**) and routing devices (col. 2, lines 1-11).

The difference between the claimed subject matter and that of Bartoldus et al., disclosed supra, is that claim 27 recites simultaneously reading data from multiple memories where the total bandwidth output from the memories matches the bandwidth of a FAT pipe port on a communication device.

Regarding claim 27, Bass et al. teaches, as seen in Figure 13, **multiple (N) different memories** such as DRAM memories. Each of these memories is attached to an associated one of the multiple (**M**) **different buses**, which inherently facilitate data movement according to a certain bandwidth. A plurality of arbiters (**different memory controllers**) are coupled to the multiple different memories, and these different memory controllers comprise the TSM **Arbiter**. The arbiters of the TSM Arbiter control the accessing of the memories, as well as the modes for accessing the memories. The

memories can be **set into two modes of operation** (col. 24, lines 36-63). Bass et al. further teaches that the memories are logically divided into sub-memories, and that these sub-memories can be logically **accessed simultaneously**. The arbiter of Bass et al. allows for such accesses in the form of writes or **read accesses** (col. 25, lines 10-18), where the read accesses are part of a read **window**. Although the Bass et al. reference does not specifically recite bandwidth in terms of the busses and memories, Bass et al. teaches that data can be read from the memories, which would inherently mean that the data travels at some speed relative to the bandwidth of the busses.

AAPA teaches that **FAT pipes** are high bandwidth channels for transmitting large amounts of data, and can be included in high-speed storage subsystems (page 2, lines 6-10).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art having the teachings of Bartoldus et al., Bass et al., and AAPA before him at the time the invention was made to modify the network system of Bartoldus et al. to include the simultaneous access memories of Bass et al. and FAT pipe bandwidth of AAPA, because then the requested data could be retrieved from the memories in a quicker fashion and use less processing cycles according to the simultaneous access and FAT pipe features.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 5-9 and 28 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Declaration under 37 CFR 1.132

The declaration under 37 CFR 1.132 filed September 20, 2004 is insufficient to overcome the rejection of claims 1-4, 25, 26, 33, and 34 based upon a specific reference under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as set forth in the last Office action because: the declarations fail to set forth facts and evidence supporting the submitted declarations.

Paragraph (3) of the submitted declaration recites that "To the extent that any subject matter claimed in the above-identified patent application was included in the United States Patent 6,460,120...we believe that such inclusion was based on details of the present invention disclosed by us, the inventors of the above-identified patent application."

Paragraph (4) of the submitted declaration next recites regarding that five of the inventors found in paragraph (3) of the submitted declaration that "All of those inventors frequently exchanged information within IBM, including ideas about the design of the overall system which included the invention of the above-identified patent application, as well as other inventions, including the invention claimed in the Bass et al. patent mentioned above."

The Examiner would like to point out that MPEP 715.01(c)(I) states that:

Where the applicant is one of the co-authors of a publication cited against his or her application, he or she may overcome the rejection by filing an affidavit or declaration under 37 CFR 1.131. Alternatively, the applicant may overcome the rejection by filing a specific affidavit or declaration under 37 CFR 1.132 establishing that the article is describing applicant's own work. An affidavit or declaration by applicant alone indicating

that applicant is the sole inventor and that the others were merely working under his or her direction is sufficient to remove the publication as a reference under 35 U.S.C. 102(a). In re Katz, 687 F.2d 450, 215 USPQ 14 (CCPA 1982).

MPEP 715.01(c)(II) recites that:

When the unclaimed subject matter of a patent, application publication, or other publication is applicant's own invention, a rejection>, which is not a statutory bar,< on that patent or publication may be removed by submission of evidence establishing the fact that the patentee, applicant of the published application, or author derived his or her knowledge of the relevant subject matter from applicant. Moreover applicant must further show that he or she made the invention upon which the relevant disclosure in the patent, application publication, or other publication is based. In re Mathews, 408 F.2d 1393, 161 USPQ 276 (CCPA 1969); In re Facius, 408 F.2d 1396, 161 USPQ 294 (CCPA 1969).

Applicants have not shown evidence supporting, or facts alleging, that would support overcoming the rejection of the aforementioned claims under the Bass et al. reference. MPEP 715.01(c)(II) states that the "... applicant must further show that he or she made the invention upon which the relevant disclosure in the patent, application publication, or other publication is based.". Merely indicating that the application inventors "believe" that the inclusion of subject matter in the patent was based on details of the present invention disclosed by the application inventors does not constitute facts or evidence. Also, stating that the inventors "...frequently exchanged information within IBM, including ideas about the design of the overall system which

included the invention of the above-identified patent application" does not constitute facts or evidence regarding the specific subject matter that applicant claims was disclosed by the applicants and included in the patent.

Further, MPEP 716.10 states that:

However, it is incumbent upon the inventors named in the application, in response to an inquiry regarding the appropriate inventorship under 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or to rebut a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) or (e), to provide a satisfactory showing by way of affidavit under 37 CFR 1.132 that the inventorship of the application is correct in that the reference discloses subject matter derived from the applicant rather than invented by the author, patentee, or applicant of the published application notwithstanding the authorship of the article or the inventorship of the patent or published application. *In re Katz*, 687 F.2d 450, 455, 215 USPQ 14, 18 (CCPA 1982) (inquiry is appropriate to clarify any ambiguity created by an article regarding inventorship and it is then incumbent upon the applicant to provide "a satisfactory showing that would lead to a reasonable conclusion that [applicant] is the ... inventor" of the subject matter disclosed in the article and claimed in the application).

According to MPEP 716.10, the applicant must correctly identify the inventorship of the application in regards to the subject matter in question. It is unclear to the Examiner, due to the lack of facts and evidence, as to which party truly invented the subject matter in question and which party merely included the subject matter. Because the current application and the patent do not have exactly the same inventors, and due to lack of any evidence or facts by way of an affidavit or declaration from the inventors of the aforementioned US patent, the Examiner believes that the applicant has not yet

provided "a satisfactory showing that would lead to a reasonable conclusion that [applicant] is the ... inventor".

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed September 20, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive as previously recited above due to the insufficiency of the 37 CFR 1.132 declaration filed September 20, 2004.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian R. Peugh whose telephone number is (571) 272-4199. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 7:00am to 4:30pm. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Friday's from 7:00am to 4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Donald Sparks, can be reached on (571) 272-4201. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.


Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-9600.

Art Unit: 2187

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



DONALD SPARKS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER



Brian R. Peugh
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2187
November 30, 2004